R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 521 VT 005 711

ES '70 REPORT NUMBER 1.

PUB DATE MAY 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.56 12P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM, *PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, *INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAMS, BEHAVORIAL OBJECTIVES, INDIVIDUALIZED CURRICULUM, NETWORKS, *INTEGRATED CURRICULUM, SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, ORGANIZATION, ARTICULATION (PROGRAM), ES 70, ORGANIC CURRICULUM,

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE SEVENTIES (ES '70) IS A PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING A NEW COMPREHENSIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND ORGANIZATION WHICH WILL--(1) PROVIDE AN INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION FOR EACH STUDENT, (2) BE RELEVANT TO THE ADULT ROLES WHICH HE WILL PLAY, (3) BE ECONOMICALLY PRACTICAL WITHIN AVAILABLE PUBLIC RESOURCES, (4) BE BASED ON BEHAVIORAL AND RELATED SCIENCES, (5) EMPLOY SUITABLE SYSTEMS OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION, (6) UTILIZE APPROPRIATE EDUCATIONALLY ORIENTED TECHNOLOGY, (7) BE LOCALLY PLANNED AND DIRECTED, (8) BE NATIONALLY COORDINATED, (9) BE FINANCED BY FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL FUNDS, AND (10) BE DESIGNED FOR ULTIMATE AVAILABILITY TO ALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS. THE ES '70 PROGRAM WILL HAVE DIRECT FUNDING BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION (USOE) WITH ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM COOPERATING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES. THE PROGRAM RESULTED FROM INITIAL PLANNING BY THE USOE AND A MEETING OF 15 SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS IN MAY 1967 WHICH ESTABLISHED AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF FOUR SUPERINTENDENTS TO GUIDE THE PROGRAM. LOCAL PROGRAM COORDINATORS, ONE NOMINATED BY EACH PARTICIPATING DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT, WERE TO BE PAID BY USOE STARTING IN THE FALL OF 1967. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BUREAU OF RESEARCH, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS NETWORK, AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS ARE DISCUSSED. PROGRESS REPORTS WILL BE CONTINUED THROUGHOUT THE 5-YEAR PROJECT. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, JULY 1967, IS REPORTED IN VT 005 712, AND THE COORDINATOR'S WORKSHOP, AUGUST 1967, AND THE NETWORK CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 1967, ARE REPORTED IN VT 005 713. (MM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED019521

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE SEVENTIES
ES '70
A PROGRAM SPONSORED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

REPORT

May 1967 . . . No. 1

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR ES '70

DR. BEN WALLACE, CHAIRMAN
SUPERINTENDENT
MINEOLA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DR. LEON M. LESSINGER
SUPERINTENDENT
SAN MATEO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DR. L. V. RASMUSSEN
SUPERINTENDENT
DULUTH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DR. ARTHUR B. WOLFE
DIRECTOR OF NOVA SCHOOLS

INITIAL PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICHIGAN
BOULDER, COLORADO
DULUTH, MINNESOTA
FT. LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
HOUSTON, TEXAS
MAMARONECK, NEW YORK
MINEOLA, NEW YORK
MONROE, MICHIGAN
QUINCY, MASSACHUSETTS
SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA
WILLINGBORO, NEW JERSEY

MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

E. F. SHELLEY AND COMPANY, INC.
1150 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036
TELEPHONE: 202/296-4059

AC005711

What is ES '70?

A program for the development of a new comprehensive secondary school curriculum and organization

-- providing an individualized education for each student

-- highly relevant to the adult roles which he will play

-- economically practical within available public resources

-- based on behavioral and related sciences

-- employing suitable systems of school organization

-- utilizing appropriate educationally oriented technology

-- locally planned and directed

-- nationally coordinated

-- financed by federal, state and local funds

-- designed for ultimate availability to all school systems

How will ES '70 be financed?

Direct funding by the Bureau of Research, U.S. Office of Education, and additional funding by cooperating public and private agencies.

How will ES '70 be organized?

The initial meeting of 15 school district superintendents on May 11th and 12th -- reported in detail here -- capped a year of preliminary planning by the U.S. Office of Education. An Executive Committee of 4 superintendents was established to guide the planning, organizing and conduct of the program. It was agreed that a local program coordinator would be nominated by each participating district superintendent and that the USOE would provide the funds to pay these coordinators starting in the Fall of 1967.

Each person nominated as a coordinator should be (and will remain) an employee of the local school district, should have the ability, authority and personal commitment required to carry through a major program of change within the local educational system, should enjoy a close working relationship with the superintendent and an established acceptance by the staff and the district school board, and should expect to devote his full time to the task of coordinating and directing this program in his district. Within these guidelines the superintendent should select a nominee who is equal to the demanding task and eager to accomplish it.

Minutes of the Organizational Meeting

1. Meeting: On May 11-12, 1967, representatives from 15 school systems met with Mr. David S. Bushnell and Dr. Robert M. Morgan of the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education. The conference was also attended by a number of special consultants. (See roster of attendees.) Meetings were held at the Nova High School, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, through the courtesy of Dr. Arthur B. Wolfe, Director of Nova Schools.

2. Purpose: The conference was called for the purpose of exploring the feasibility of establishing cooperation among a network of selected school systems and the Bureau of Research of USOE in a coordinated effort to accelerate the development of an organic curriculum for the grade levels 9-12.

3. Need: Mr. Bushnell and Dr. Morgan opened the conference with statements reviewing the needs for modification of our present-day program and the opportunities available for effecting a modification. These needs and opportunities had been previously described in more detail by Mr. Bushnell in a paper on "Ferment in Education" and another paper, "Designing an Organic Curriculum", prepared by Mr. Bushnell and Dr. Morgan.

Attention was focused on two broad goals. The first is the goal of a curriculum integrating academic training, occupational training and personal development experience. The student, upon leaving the school system, should be equipped with entry-level occupational skills and also with the qualifications necessary for continued education.

The second major goal is a systems designed educational program. This program will be learner centered. It will utilize modern technology to provide maximum flexibility in the progress of each individual toward meaningful goals. It will make use of instructional techniques and media of demonstrated value in reaching specified behavioral objectives.

4. Role of the Bureau of Research: The proposed system must be developed in and by existing schools. The cooperating school systems will constitute an on-line laboratory for the development, testing and modification of the organic curriculum. The Bureau of Research will facilitate the project in three major directions ; planning, systems management and providing and securing financial support.

It is anticipated that the cooperating local school systems will require coordinated systems support from many agencies. In addition to the Bureau of Research, cooperation in various forms will be solicited from other agencies in the Federal Government, from state and regional educational agencies, from foundations, from universities and other institutional resources, and from special segments of private industry such as publishers.

The Bureau of Research has engaged E.F. Shelley and Company, Inc., of New York and Washington to provide support in the systems analysis and systems design required to coordinate the efforts and contributions of all participating institutions, agencies and individuals. E.F. Shelley will also assist in the preparation of summary reports of the progress of the project. (More details will be found in "Scope of the Work under Contract #0EC 1-7-071037-3596".)

5. Group Discussion of Plan: The members of the group reacted favorably to the general concept of an organic curriculum and a systems designed program. The following matters of additional concern were voiced.

a. It is important to establish and maintain proper liaison with appropriate educational authorities in State Governments.

b. The system must be responsive to a society with changing values and work patterns. Stable elements within the flux must be found and emphasized.

c. Opportunities for the use of leisure time should be recognized in the design.

d. It is important for all school systems in the network to learn about the current activities of other schools in the network.

e. Further clarification is needed concerning the role of the Bureau of Research in facilitating the work of the project.

f. The goals of the project cannot be specified solely in terms of some school in the future. Each school has local commitments to children now in school. The problem is to move the on-going system forward toward the project objectives.

g. Priorities must be established for detailed formulation of goals, analysis of needs, the procedures to be employed and similar questions.

h. Precautions should be taken to prevent the project from being thought of as the latest fad. This suggests avoiding a catchy name and too early visibility.

6. The Organizational Structure of the Network: The implementation of the plan to coordinate the efforts of the school systems in the network requires some organizational structure. Six key questions regarding the structure were posed, and the conference divided into task forces to consider the questions and make recommendations. These questions and the recommendations presented by the task forces are as follows:

(1) Should the network reflect regional needs and logistics?

Dr. Jarvis Barnes presented the following suggestions from his group.

a. The overall structural organization for the project may be likened to a pyramid with the USOE at the top, the local educational administrations at the base and state and regional organizations in the middle.

b. The USOE will provide leadership and service functions. The local school educational authorities will be the administrative agencies.

c. More specifically the USOE will:

-- describe the program - both broad and specific objectives.
-- select participating schools.
-- coordinate activities among all participants.
-- aid in securing supplementary funds.
-- obtain assistance from supportive resources such as federal, regional, state and private agencies.
-- conduct orientation and training sessions.
-- establish project time tables.
-- prepare materials.

d. Local administrative agencies will:

-- commit systems to participate.
-- plan, organize, direct educational program.
-- disseminate information on local, state and national levels.
-- select and organize staff for development and implementation.
-- design plan of action for local system.
-- identify needs for personnel, procedures, funds and timetable for accomplishing objectives.
-- coordinate local activities with nationwide project.
-- implement program.

(2) What should the relationship be between the USOE and the State Department of Education, regional offices and local districts?

Mr. John Rosser reported the following suggestions from his group.

a. The USOE should arrange an early meeting of a representative of the USOE with local superintendents and their chief state educational officer to discuss the project and its direction. Local administrative officers will suggest proper procedures to follow for their respective states.

b. The USOE and local authorities should maintain a direct relationship in the organization and operation of the project.

c. The USOE, State Departments and local districts will cooperate in soliciting funding from other governmental agencies and outside funding sources.

d. U. S. regional offices should be kept informed by the USOE.

e. The local districts will seek cooperation from teachers' associations at the local level. The USOE should establish similiar contact at the national level.

f. A committee should be appointed from the conference participants to serve as a steering committee. It should consist of four or five members and is expected to meet more frequently than the entire membership.

(3) How should the problem of articulation and fragmentation be handled in relating the group 9-12 with other groups such as K-8 and higher education?

Dr. Minna Post Peyser reported the following suggestions.

a. A more precise specification of the scope of the program is needed. Consideration should be given to K-14 range rather than restrict changes to 9-12 grades.

Further questions are:

Is the program for college bound students?
Is present college preparation good enough?
Is new program proposed for limited number of hours per week?
Who would start the changes?
Freedom of individual districts to adapt elements of the project.

b. Teacher training and retraining will be required.

c. Salary -- and union -- problems may arise if extra work is required of participating teachers.

d. Time, money and the extent of USOE commitment will largely determine the model to be followed in the articulation of changes. Several models exist. Local districts will determine the variables.

Dr. Morgan reported that the project was restricted to the 9-12 group for practical reasons. However, this does not preclude articulation at the local level. Furthermore, the direction of the project is away from the concept of fixed grade or age levels.

(4) What are the behavioral objectives of the project? What model should be followed in this formulation and how is progress to be evaluated?

Dr. Alexander Schure reported the following suggestions.

a. A precise formulation of behavioral objectives is a prerequisite for the project.

b. The objectives may not be completely uniform among all participating systems.

c. There are existing models that can be assembled and used as a take-off point for the design of the project.

d. There is need for a dialogue among different groups using different terminology but concerned with the same problems.

e. Areas of agreement and disagreement should be determined and used as a basis to determine further research needs.

f. There are relevant models for evaluation.

g. In general, there is a need to assemble and disseminate information in these areas.

Dr. Alan F. Westin reported briefly on the work of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties at Columbia University. The Center may well serve as a resource center for models in the analysis of behavioral objectives and experimental efforts to modify behavior in the specified direction. The Center is also conducting teacher training programs.

Dr. Louis S. Levine described an example of their work in the formulation of a three dimensional matrix interrelating pupil variables, environmental variables and variations in learning intervention.

(5) Who will manage the project? What resources are needed? What meetings should be scheduled?

Dr. Leon M. Lessinger reported the following suggestions.

a. The USOE has a coordinating and funding role.

b. The USOE should develop a master plan for the project.

c. Resource Centers should be contacted or established. Local districts would identify a problem and seek advice from the Center. The Center would provide support in developing a plan and securing support. It might also assist in training teachers.

d. There is an immediate need to identify a local staff member to work full time on the project. Appointments should be selected and trained this summer. Specifications for the person to be selected will be prepared and forwarded to the conference participants by E. F. Shelley.

e. The project will require some management innovations. Systems management support will be provided by E. F. Shelley and Company.

f. There is a need for the early identification of resources to be made available. For example, coordinating staff members will need immediate training.

(6) How should a communication network be set up?

No task force was assigned to discuss this problem. Recommendations may be expected at a later date.

7. Participating School Systems: Representatives from all the school systems participating in the conference expressed a desire to have their schools included in the network for the project. They will take the necessary steps to secure commitment at the local level.

8. Next Meeting: It was agreed that the next meeting of the group should be held after September 15 in Duluth, Minnesota. By holding meetings in different places, representatives of the participating schools will be given the opportunity to see some of the innovations at other schools in the network.

9. Executive Committee: An Executive Committee was appointed in accordance with the recommendation of one of the task forces. The Committee consists of Dr. Ben Wallace, Dr. Leon M. Lessinger, Dr. L.V. Rasmussen, and Dr. Arthur B. Wolfe. Dr. Wallace was elected Chairman.

10. Meeting of the Executive Committee: The Executive Committee met immediately after the final session of the Conference. Also present were Mr. Bushnell, Dr. Morgan, Mr. Shelley and Dr. Blyth.

a. Priorities -- It was agreed that there is an immediate need for action on the following items.

A statement about the purpose of the project and anticipated funding activities. This statement is intended for use by District Superintendents in communicating with local and State agencies.

A statement specifying the personal qualifications for coordinators to be appointed by local districts, together with an indication of proposed arrangements for financing the appointees.

A procedure for generating behavioral objectives.
Plans for a teacher training system.

b. Project Support -- The need for careful attention to the following additional matters emerged in discussion.

Provision should be made for some common experience for all the teachers in the network of schools who are working in similar problems.

Behavioral objectives when formulated should be communicated to local Boards and other centers of influence. The purpose is to provide assistance in explaining the project and eliciting support. The objectives must, of course, also be communicated internally within a school to the technical faculty.

Cooperation among the local districts is essential.

An overall time schedule for projected involvement is needed.

A dimensional analysis of current activities in the 15 schools in the network is needed at an early date. It will serve to establish a base line for the evaluation of expected changes.

The USOE should communicate more details of their hopes and plans for the project to Superintendents. Superintendents will be useful in communicating to groups such as N.E.A.

c. Committee Functions -- Specific responsibilities of the Executive Committee will include:

Approval of the proposed statement regarding the purpose and funding of the project.

Approval of the specification for local coordinators.

Determine adequacy of the representation in the 15 schools in the network.

Consider -- at next meeting -- a plan prepared by the USOE for teacher training.

Study contractual arrangements for implementation of elements in the project.

Expedite arrangements among the USOE, local districts, and contractors.

Examine the overall blueprint for carrying out the project. This should be a major item for the September meeting of the entire group.

d. Next Meeting -- The Executive Committee scheduled its next meeting for July 28, 1967. The meeting will be held at the offices of the Superintendent, District 10, Mineola Public Schools, Mineola, N.Y. Dr. Ben Wallace will make the arrangements.

Attendance Roster

Fort Lauderdale
May 11-12, 1967

School Superintendents
and Associates

Mr. Johnnie B. Whiteley, Asst. Supt., Houston Public Schools, Houston, Texas
Mr. F. D. Wesley, Principal, Booker T. Washington H.S., Houston, Texas

Mr. Eugene L. Johnson, Supt., Bloomfield Hills Public Schools, Michigan
Mr. Robert Boston, Asst. Supt. Curriculum, Bloomfield Hills Public Schools, Michigan

Dr. Robert E. Pruitt, Supt., Quincy Public Schools, Quincy, Mass.
Dr. Lawrence Creedon, Admin. Asst., Quincy Public Schools, "

Dr. Harold C. Rapson, Supt., Monroe Public Schools, Monroe, Mich.
Mr. Leo Perelman, Principal - High School, Monroe, Mich.

Dr. Ben Wallace, Supt., Mineola Public Schools, Mineola, N.Y.

Dr. Leon M. Lessinger, Supt., San Mateo Public Schools, San Mateo, California
Dr. Edward Walsh, Supervisor, Instruction Programs, San Mateo, California

Dr. L. V. Rasmussen, Supt., Duluth Public Schools, Duluth, Minn.
Mr. Thorwald Esbenson, Duluth Public Schools, Duluth, Minn.

Dr. E. G. Burnkrant, Supt., Boulder Public Schools, Boulder, Colo.
Dr. Richard Fawley, Director of Curriculum, Boulder, Colo.

Dr. Harry Q. Packer, Supt., Willingboro Public Schools, Willingboro, New Jersey
Mr. John Rosser, Staff, Willingboro Public Schools, Willingboro, New Jersey

Dr. Bernard Haake, Supt., Mamaroneck Public Schools, Mamaroneck, New York
Mr. Joseph Downey, Principal, Mamaroneck Senior High School, Mamaroneck, New York

Dr. Fred Brown, Jr., Asst. Supt. of Instruction Services, State of Maryland
Dr. Howard C. Allison, Supervisor Instr. Federal Programs, State of Maryland

Dr. John Letson, Supt., Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia
Dr. Jarvis Barnes, Asst. Supt. Research and Development, "

Dr. Carl Proehl, Asst. Supt., Vocational & Technical Education, Dept. of Education, Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Arthur B. Wolfe, Director of Nova Schools, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
Dr. Warren G. Smith, Tech. Science Supervisor, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Consultants

Dr. Alan F. Westin, Director, Center for Research & Education in American Liberties, Columbia University, N.Y.

Dr. Minna Post Peyser, Assoc. Dir. of Center
Dr. Louis S. Levine, Staff

Dr. Alexander Schure, Pres., New York Institute of Technology, New York
Dr. Bertram Spector, V. Pres., Research, New York Institute of Technology, New York

Mr. E. F. Shelley, President, E.F. Shelley and Co., Inc. N.Y.
Dr. John Blyth, Historian, E.F. Shelley and Co., Inc. N.Y.

U.S. Office of Education

Mr. David S. Bushnell, Director, Div. of Adult and Vocational Research, Washington, D. C.
Dr. Robert M. Morgan, Deputy Director, Div. of Adult and Vocational Research, Washington, D. C.